



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,659	10/24/2003	Jeffrey P. Snover	MSI-1741US	9647

22801 7590 06/15/2005
LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2165

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/693,659

Applicant(s)

SNOVER ET AL.

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/1/2004, 2 pages.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.



DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to because the arrangement of the disclosed application does not conform with 37 CFR 1.77(b).

Section heading appear **boldfaced** and underlined throughout the disclosed specification.

Section headings should not be **boldfaced** and/or underlined. Appropriate corrections are required according to the guidelines provided below:

2. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)

Art Unit: 2165

(e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

(1) Field of the Invention.

(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

(f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

(g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

(h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,460) in view of Risberg et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,339,392).

As to claim 1, Knight et al teaches in an interactive operating environment (see Abstract, where "interactive operating environment" is read on "shared storage network") that accepts a command string (see column 19, lines 15-20), the command string including a plurality of strings (see figures 21A through 21C), a computer readable medium having computer executable instructions (see column 41, lines 1-14), the instructions comprising:

Art Unit: 2165

for any string that is partially unresolved, initiating an operating environment mechanism for analyzing the partially unresolved string to completely resolve the string (see column 37, lines 38-59.)

Knight et al does not teach receiving a plurality of strings (although “building strings and substrings” is taught in column 37, lines 14-37.)

Risberg et al teaches a custom active document (see Abstract), in which he teaches receiving a plurality of strings (see column 10, lines 4-28 and see column 21, line 67 through column 22, line 11.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Knight et al to include receiving a plurality of strings.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Knight et al by the teaching of Risberg et al, because including receiving a plurality of strings, would enable the system to be distributed among remote resources, wherein command (strings) are generated by various entities of the system and transmitted (and received) by the resolving component.

As to claim 2, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the unresolved string is associated with a first data type and the mechanism comprises looking up a conversion for converting the first data type to another data type (see Risberg et al, column 118, lines 38-46.)

As to claim 3, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the unresolved string is associated with a data type that is not natively supported by the operating environment, the mechanism comprises retrieving extended information that defines the data type and creating an instance of the data type (see Knight et al, column 37, lines 48-59.)

As to claims 4, 16 and 21, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the extended information comprises extended metadata and code, the extended metadata describes the data type and the code comprises additional instructions to populate the instance of the data type (see Risberg et al, column 104, lines 23-61.)

As to claim 5, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the unresolved string includes a wildcard and the mechanism comprises resolving the string based on the wildcard (see Knight et al, column 15, lines 1-35, and see column 19, lines 43-65.)

As to claim 6, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the unresolved string includes a property set and the mechanism comprises identifying a plurality of properties associated with the property set and performing subsequent processing associated with the command string using the plurality of properties (see Knight et al, column 38, line 60 through column 39, line 4.)

As to claim 7, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the unresolved string includes a relation and the mechanism comprises querying an ontology service for information based on the relation (see Knight et al, column 21, lines 6-18 and see column 26, lines 40-49.)

As to claim 8, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the unresolved string comprises a property path, the property path comprises a series of components that provide navigation to a desired property (see Knight et al, column 37, lines 48-59.)

As to claim 9, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the mechanism performs a look-up to resolve each component (see Knight et al, column 40, lines 25-50.)

As to claim 10, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein each component comprises a property for an associated object, a method for the associated object, a field for the associated object, a third party property, or a third party method (see Knight et al, column 62, lines 39-53.)

As to claim 11, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the associated object comprises an object associated with a preceding component (see Knight et al, column 18, lines 51-63, and see column 31, lines 12-24.)

As to claim 12, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the look-up comprises a priority based look-up (see Knight et al, column 40, lines 25-50.)

As to claim 13, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein a component comprises a reference to registered code (see Knight et al, column 15, lines 1-35.)

As to claim 14, Knight et al teaches a computer readable medium having computer executable instructions (see column 41, lines 1-14), the instructions comprising:

receiving input via an operating environment (see Abstract, where “operating environment” is read on “shared storage network”), the input including content that uses a data type that is not natively supported by the operating environment (see column 37, lines 48-59);

retrieving extended information that defines the data type (see column 69, lines 33-46);
and

creating an instance of the data type (see column 17, lines 31-40.)

Knight et al does not teach receiving parseable input.

Risberg et al teaches receiving parseable input (see column 10, lines 4-28, see column 21, line 67 through column 22, line 11, and see column 58, lines 12-19.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Knight et al to include receiving parseable input.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Knight et al by the teaching of Risberg et al, because including receiving parseable input, would enable the system to be distributed among remote

resources, wherein input command (strings) are generated by various entities of the system and parsed (transmitted and received) by the resolving component.

As to claims 15 and 20, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the parseable input comprises a Windows Management Instrumentation (WMI) input, an ActiveX Data Object (ADO) input, an XML input, or a third party data format (see Risberg et al, column 43, line 62 through column 44, line 45, and see column 76, lines 45-52.)

As to claims 17 and 22, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the parseable input comprises a third party object that provides an additional property to an object supported natively within the operating environment (see Risberg et al, column 10, lines 4-28, see column 21, line 67 through column 22, line 11, and see column 58, lines 12-19

As to claims 18 and 23, Knight et al as modified, teaches wherein the parseable input comprises an ontology service (see Knight et al, column 21, lines 6-18 and see column 26, lines 40-49.)

As to claim 19, Knight et al teaches a system that extends data types available to an operating environment (see Abstract), the system comprising:

a processor (see column 41, line 6); and

a memory, the memory being allocated for a plurality of computer-executable instructions which are loaded into the memory for execution by the processor (see column

Art Unit: 2165

41, lines 1-14, and see column 86, lines 58-65), the computer-executable instructions comprising:

For the remaining steps of this claim, the applicant is directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 and 14 above.

5. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4078. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (571) 272-4083.

tm

June 3, 2005


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER